

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated July 27, 2006. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the present amendments is found throughout various sections of the present application Specification as originally filed. For example, Fig. 1 shows the Source Server 2 and Destination Server 4, while Figs. 4 and 5 illustrate operation at the source server and destination server respectively. Similarly, as another example of support for the present amendments, the text at line 18 page 10 through line 17 page 11 discloses a source server assignment process for the first updated include set of recipient entities, while the text at line 18 page 11 through line 7 of page 12 discloses a destination server determination of the result of difference operation between the include and exclude sets.

At paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, citing U.S. patent application publication 2003/0061289 of Clissold et al. ("Clissold et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Clissold et al. disclose a system for excluding recipients from a list of recipients. The Clissold et al. system user interface includes an addressee box, a carbon copy box, a blind copy box, and an exclusion box to exclude recipients. Before actually sending a message to a list of recipients, the Clissold et al. system checks to see whether any one of the recipients are indicated by an entry in the exclusion box. If so, then the Clissold et al. system extricates the address of the recipient from the list and forwards the message to the rest of the recipients.

Nowhere in Clissold et al. is there disclosed or suggested the processing of a message for transmission that includes:

...
assigning, by said source server system, a difference between said include set of recipient entities and said exclude set of recipient entities to said include set of recipient entities;
determining, by a destination server system, a result of a difference operation between said include set of recipient entities and said exclude set of recipient entities; and
sending, by said destination server system, said message to destinations indicated by those recipient entities within said result of said difference operation between said include set of recipient entities and said exclude set of recipient entities.

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 7, 13, 19 and 20 include analogous features. In contrast, Clissold et al. describes a system operating on multiple user computer systems and a mail server. Clissold et al. states at the beginning of paragraph 35 as follows:

The invention uses an added box, an exclusion box, in the GUI to instruct either ***the mail server*** or the computer system in use by the user not to send message to certain email addresses in the e-mail distribution list. (emphasis added)

Similarly, at the first sentence of paragraph 36, Clissold et al. state: "In operation, when ***the mail server*** receives the message and the distribution list, . . . " And in the second sentence of paragraph 38 of Clissold et al., the following sentence also describes the single server approach: "When an e-mail message is sent to ***the mail server***, the process starts."

The above cited portions of Clissold et al. are examples of how Clissold et al. fails to disclose or suggest the assignment of a difference between an include set and an exclude set to the include set ***at a source server***, combined with the determination of a result of a difference operation between the include set and the exclude set ***at a destination server***, as in the present independent claims. Moreover, Clissold et al. includes no teaching with regard to using any type of operations performed specifically at source servers and/or destination servers.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that all the features of each of the present independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19 and 20 are not disclosed or suggested by Clissold et al. The present independent claims are accordingly not anticipated by Clissold et al. As to the remaining claims, they each depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19 and 20, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Clissold et al. for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at (617) 630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 27, 2006
Date

/David A. Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-002